

We have the opportunity right now instead of paying royalties to the companies that are providing us with our energy, we can now invest in alternative ways of finding resources to be able to provide the energy for our people and to stimulate the business growth, especially in Ohio and hopefully in America as well.

It is important to realize that we have the opportunities to burn ethanol. I am excited about the fact that certainly in my area we have an abundance of coal, and with clean coal technology we can create more energy. We have the opportunity now, Mr. Speaker, to look at coal-to-liquid fuel as an alternative to lessen our dependency on foreign oil. I truly believe that this is a move in the right direction, Mr. Speaker, and something that will help. I am looking forward to resolving the energy problems of our country.

□ 1015

## PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, reserving my right to object, could the Speaker tell me why we are limiting 1-minute to five per side, yet we are getting out today in the middle of the day at 2 o'clock?

Mr. Speaker, I will accept that for an answer. I just wanted to ask the question and make sure that we understood that we are.

## NO REASON TO CELEBRATE

(Mr. PRICE of Georgia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, today the majority party will increase taxes on American oil companies and, hence, on all Americans. And they will increase our dependence on foreign oil. This will complete the sixth item of the majority party's initial agenda. This is the sixth time, but certainly not the last time, that Democrats will put forth a policy that fills a sound bite, but not sound policy. And according to a Democrat clock that stops and starts when it is politically convenient, they will be completed within 100 hours.

While those from across the aisle will pat themselves on the back, this is no cause for celebration. Adopting legislation without allowing consideration by any committee, or even a single amendment, is not a reason to celebrate. Applying the rules of the House only when they serve your purpose are no rules at all. And a blatant disregard to follow through on promises made in November shatters the trust of the American people and is no reason to celebrate.

This is the people's House. It thrives when ideas are wrestled with and challenged. The best ideas and solutions then rise to the top.

Mr. Speaker, the American people are watching. Doing anything less is no reason to celebrate.

## A NEW DIRECTION

(Mr. McDERMOTT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, today we are going to discuss energy and a new direction.

The Speaker has set a vision to get us off our oil addiction. And in order to do that, we have got to find some money to begin to develop alternative energy sources.

Now, the newspapers today are filled with stories about why we are still in Iraq. We are trying to get a law passed over there that puts in production sharing agreements with the big oil companies of this country. We are trying to get a hold of the Iraqis' oil. We want to take 70 percent of the profits at the beginning.

Now, no Iraqi who has any nationalist feelings is going to sign that, and that is why we are still there 4 years later. We are still trying to get a hold of their oil and control it.

This country has to take the beginning step today, with H.R. 6, to get us off this oil addiction. Alternative energy, whether you are talking solar or wind or biomass or bio diesel, all these are ways that Americans can use for energy and we don't have to live off the rest of the world. We get 3 percent of our oil from the United States. All the rest comes from outside. We are totally dependent on it.

## COUNTY PAYMENT

(Mr. WALDEN of Oregon asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WALDEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, this Congress and the last have failed to keep the Federal Government's commitment to the people who live near our national forests. This breach of faith means 100 hardworking county employees in Jackson County, Oregon, will lose their jobs in June. That is 10 percent of the county's workforce.

Within 3 months, Jackson County will close all 15 county libraries and slash their road budget.

Remember the heart wrenching search for the Kim family lost in the national forest in southern Oregon? Jackson County used their equipment to help in that search, equipment and personnel paid for by the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act. As Jackson County Commissioner C.W. Smith said: "Loss of this program is a national domestic funding crisis."

I call on the Democratic leadership to put H.R. 17 on your 100-hour legislative agenda. Keep faith with rural schools and counties. Keep the word of the Federal Government to timbered communities.

## ELECTION OF MEMBERS TO COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 73) and I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 73

*Resolved*, That the following named Members be and are hereby elected to the following standing committee of the House of Representatives:

(1) COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET.—Ms. DeLauro, Mr. Edwards, Mrs. Capps, Mr. Cooper, Mr. Allen, Ms. Schwartz of Pennsylvania, Ms. Kaptur, Mr. Becerra, Mr. Doggett, Mr. Blumenauer, Mr. Berry, Mr. Boyd of Florida, Mr. McGovern, Ms. Sutton, Mr. Andrews, Mr. Scott of Virginia, Mr. Etheridge, Ms. Hooley, Mr. Baird, Mr. Moore of Kansas, Mr. Bishop of New York.

Mr. PALLONE (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CAPUANO). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the initial request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## CLEAN ENERGY ACT OF 2007

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 66 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

H. RES. 66

*Resolved*, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 6) to reduce our Nation's dependency on foreign oil by investing in clean, renewable, and alternative energy resources, promoting new emerging energy technologies, developing greater efficiency, and creating a Strategic Energy Efficiency and Renewables Reserve to invest in alternative energy, and for other purposes. All points of order against the bill and against its consideration are waived except those arising under clauses 9 or 10 of rule XXI. The bill shall be considered as read. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) three hours of debate, with 60 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means, 60 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Natural Resources, 30 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Agriculture, and 30 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Science and Technology; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 2. During consideration of H.R. 6 pursuant to this resolution, notwithstanding the operation of the previous question, the Chair

may postpone further consideration of the bill to a time designated by the Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, for the purposes of debate only, I yield my friend from Florida (Mr. DIAZ-BALART) 30 minutes, pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

Mr. Speaker, H. Res. 66 is a closed rule that allows the House to consider the final piece of the first-100-hours agenda. This rule, as has been mentioned, provides 3 hours of debate in the House, with 60 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means, 60 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Natural Resources, 30 minutes equally divided and controlled by the Committee on Agriculture, and 30 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member on the Committee on Science and Technology.

Mr. Speaker, I expect that we will hear a great deal from my friends on the other side of the aisle about process, and they will be upset that this is a closed rule.

Mr. Speaker, Democrats campaigned on changing the culture in Washington. We campaigned on ending the culture of corruption and on draining the swamp, and we have done that. We campaigned most importantly, Mr. Speaker, on doing what is right for hardworking American families whose priorities and whose concerns have been ignored for the last 12 years.

Over the last 100 hours, Mr. Speaker, the House has voted to clean up the ethical mess in Congress, to strengthen homeland security, to combat the Federal deficit by instituting pay-as-you-go rules, to invest in lifesaving stem cell research, to make college more affordable by lowering the interest rates on student loans, to reduce prescription drug prices for seniors by allowing the government to negotiate lower prescription drug prices, and to increase the minimum wage for millions of hardworking and underpaid workers in America.

Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to note that each of these initiatives not only has passed the House of Representatives, but has enjoyed strong bipartisan support.

And in a difference in approach to legislation compared to the Republican majority in the past, who used to subscribe to the rule that they would only bring measures to the floor if a majority of the majority on their side supported it, I am happy to report that yesterday's vote on making college tuition more affordable for our young people not only enjoyed a majority of the majority in terms of support, but a majority of the minority actually voted in support, and that is refreshing.

Mr. Speaker, we made a promise to the American people that we would achieve these goals quickly, and that is what we have done. And in order to keep that promise to the voters, we have utilized an expedited process.

With the passage of this rule, the House will consider H.R. 6, the CLEAN Energy Act of 2007. As an original cosponsor of this legislation, I am proud to stand here in support of this initiative.

The voters sent us a message in November. They called us to account for bill after bill of kickbacks to special interests like Big Oil. We were not sent here to allow huge corporations to continue to reap the benefits of tax breaks while gouging their customers at the gas pump. I commend Speaker PELOSI and Majority Leader HOYER for holding true to their commitments and listening to the American people by bringing this legislation to the floor for a vote.

The distinguished chairmen of the Committees on Ways and Means, Mr. RANGEL, and Natural Resources, Mr. RAHALL, crafted this legislation to balance fiscal responsibility with our Nation's growing energy needs.

At long last, Mr. Speaker, Congress is putting its money where its mouth is and increasing our investment in renewable energy. We are not just talking the talk; we are walking the walk. We promised no quick fixes. It took years of failed legislative policy to dig us into this hole. But the bill before us today will set us on the path toward energy independence.

For years, experts have warned of an impending energy crisis. They pointed to the Nation's increasing oil and gas consumption and called attention to our limited supply of these natural resources. Unfortunately, Congress and the Bush administration failed to heed these warnings. In fact, under the Republican-controlled Congress, Federal investment in alternative energy sources actually decreased over the past decade. And at the same time, the administration prescribed more of the same, giveaways to the oil and gas industries.

During the 109th Congress, President Bush heralded the Republican Energy Policy Act of 2005 as a necessary approach to the Nation's energy crisis. In all, it provided \$8.1 billion, let me repeat that, \$8.1 billion in tax incentives for the entire energy industry. And despite their record profits, oil and gas companies took 93 percent of these tax breaks, \$7.5 billion.

Now, I suppose that that shouldn't be a surprise to many people here, given the fact that in the 2006 elections the oil companies gave \$17.5 million to candidates running for Congress. \$14.5 million of that money went to Republicans.

Mr. Speaker, all that money going to the oil industry did not leave very much money for alternative and renewable energy supplies. So, Mr. Speaker, when that energy bill was debated, many of us on this side of the aisle

voiced concerns that the bill would do nothing to ease the price of gas at the pump or decrease our dependence on foreign oil or provide significant investment in renewable sources of energy.

I should say, Mr. Speaker, there is study after study after study, news article after news article after news article which support our concerns, unfortunately.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 6 is a critical step in the right direction. It closes the tax loophole for oil companies which provided Conoco Phillips \$106 million in 2005, even as that company enjoyed profits totaling \$13.5 billion. It rolls back tax breaks for geological studies for oil exploration and repeals five royalty relief provisions from the 2005 energy bill.

□ 1030

Finally, Mr. Speaker, and I think most importantly, for a lot of us who believe that we need to do more to achieve energy independence, it reinvests those funds into clean, renewable energy and energy efficiency. Certainly, there are no easy solutions to remedy our energy crisis.

But we know one thing for certain, if we fail to pass this bill and make the necessary changes and investments now, our dependency on foreign oil will continue to worsen. The time to is now. For those who want the same old, same old, who are married to the status quo, vote the rule down. But for those who are tired of being dictated to by big oil companies, for those who believe that we should reinvest in renewable energy, for those who believe that citizens matter more than campaign contributions, vote "yes" on this rule.

Chairman RAHALL said in his testimony before the Rules Committee 2 days ago that what we are considering today is just the first step. We have much more that we need to do. I look forward to working with him and other Members of this Congress and moving this country forward.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the leadership, Mr. RANGEL and Mr. RAHALL, for their work. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting the rule and supporting the supporting bill.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would like to thank the gentleman from Massachusetts for the time.

Fairness, openness, sunshine, transparency, bipartisanship, those are just some of the words that the new majority used to describe the way they were going to run the 110th Congress. But today, as we begin debate on the sixth bill of the Democrats' "100 Hours for 6" or 100 hours agenda, we have seen all too clearly, Mr. Speaker, the truth about those promises.

They have been, at best, hollow promises.

On Tuesday of this week, the Committee on Rules met to take testimony and report a rule on the legislation that has been brought to the floor today. Before any testimony was even taken, the distinguished chairwoman of the committee announced that the committee's majority would report out a closed rule.

After the chairwoman's declaration, there really was not any need for testimony or debate on any amendments. The Rules Committee had been closed for business. The majority had already made up its mind to block amendments despite any merits of all possible amendments that could be brought before the committee.

Mr. Speaker, it is difficult to see how you can claim an open and transparent process when you block all amendments before they are even brought before the committee.

During consideration of the bills that comprised the Contract with America in 1995, we Republicans allowed consideration of 154 Democrat amendments; 48 Democrat amendments eventually passed the House and were included in the Contract with America bills that passed the House of Representatives.

But that is not what we see happening today, Mr. Speaker. Today as we consider the last of the new majority's 100 hour agenda, we have not had the chance to debate one amendment, not even one.

From either party, they have been consistent, they close out their Members as well. They promised openness, they promised transparency. Some openness, some transparency.

According to the majority leader's office, Mr. Speaker, we have over 65 hours left in the so-called 100 hours for 2006. The reality is that we have more than enough time, more than enough time to debate some thoughtful amendments. What does the majority plan to do with the rest of their 100 hours? Are we to expect more closed rules?

The 100 hours for 2006 campaign means that six people make all the decisions, apparently. I would imagine it is the Speaker, the majority leader, the whip, the caucus chairman and two others, six for '06 and six for '07 and six for '08, but then the American people get to speak again.

Now, Democrats claim that Congress already debated the bills last year, the bills that are being brought forth to the floor. While it is true that some provisions have come before the Congress in other legislation in previous Congresses, provisions that may be in legislation brought before us under these closed rules that shut out all the amendments, there are many aspects of the bills, including the bill today, that have never seen the light of day. Even more important is that our 54 new colleagues, they were not here for any of our previous debates. Four committees of jurisdiction have jurisdiction over the bill that the majority brings to the floor at this time, Ways and Means, Resources, Budget and Rules. Yet the ma-

jority did not allow any of those committees of jurisdiction to hold any hearings or debate the bill.

I am honored to serve as the ranking member on the Rules Subcommittee on Legislative and Budget Process, which has jurisdiction over parts of this underlying consideration. The subcommittee has never held a hearing on the bill. The majority decided it was better if the bill never saw the light of day in any committee process.

I think it is important to recall why we have committees, why we have a committee process. The committee process allows Members to understand the merits and implications of bills and to vet, refine and amend legislation. Completely shutting out committees of jurisdiction is certainly not healthy for the democratic process.

This year we have already seen what happens when you bypass the committee process and blindly bring legislation to the floor. We get outcomes, such as the one in the minimum wage bill that ends up exempting companies from paying the minimum wage in American Samoa. If it had gone through the committee process, at least we would have known about that aspect of the bill. If we had held hearings on the underlying bill before us today, we would learn some of the consequences of this bill.

For example, some bill would cut back on incentives for domestic production of oil and gas. Those incentives are aimed, and the existing incentives, are aimed at reducing U.S. dependence on foreign oil by encouraging domestic exploration and production of oil and natural gas. Removal of those incentives will drive up the cost, obviously, for those who search for oil and gas and thus increase our dependence on foreign suppliers, such as Venezuela and Nigeria. Those countries, I would maintain, are not reliable sources. In the case of Venezuela, its government is clearly anti-American. Do we really want to rely on those countries? Apparently the majority today is saying yes.

Republicans are committed to increasing clean energy supplies and increasing our domestic energy sources. Since 2001, we have seen the investment of nearly \$12 billion to develop cleaner, cheaper and more reliable domestic energy sources. This includes the development of biofuels such as cellulosic ethanol, advanced hybrid and plug-in, hybrid electric vehicle technologies, hydrogen fuel cell technologies, wind and solar energy, clean coal and advanced nuclear technologies.

You know, we hear my friend from Massachusetts talking about the fact that some tax breaks or unfair tax breaks were given to the oil and gas companies. It is interesting, because I was seeing a report from the Congressional Research Service that talks about despite the fact that there has been a lot of talk and there continues to be a lot of talk over the tax breaks

given to big oil in the energy bill that we passed in 2005, in reality, that energy bill substantially raised taxes on the oil and gas industry \$300 million. There was a \$300 million tax increase, according to the Congressional Research Service, while at the same time, giving more than almost \$9 billion in tax incentives for alternative clean and renewable energy resources.

The bottom line, Mr. Speaker, is that we should not be considering closed rule after closed rule after closed rule and systematically bypassing the committee process. This constant bypass operation that our friends on the other side of the aisle have become enamored to, the constant bypass operation, it really constitutes an affront, I would say, to the democratic spirit as well as, obviously, to the promises that were repeated and repeated by our friends on the other side of the aisle before they arrived and constituted and instituted the continuous, constant bypass operation, bypass the committees, bypass the Members, bypass the possibility of amendments, and go straight to the floor with legislation that no one has seen. That is not healthy. That is not healthy, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. First of all, let me thank the gentleman from Florida for voting with the Democratic majority in support of increasing the minimum wage and for voting with us to make it more affordable for students to go to college. We appreciate your support. Judging from his statement on this bill, I get the sense that he is opposed to the underlying bill.

Let me just say if you are opposed to the underlying bill, vote "no" for everything. If you are for the same old, same old, if you want more, if you support tax breaks and subsidies for big oil, if you are against investing more in renewable energy, vote "no" on the rule, vote "no" on the underlying bill. I mean, that is the way this place works. That is your right.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished member of the Rules Committee, the gentlelady from Ohio (Ms. SUTTON).

Ms. SUTTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, 2 weeks ago we passed legislation to end the culture of corruption in Congress. Today we consider legislation to reverse some of the harmful consequences of that corruption. H.R. 6, the CLEAN Energy Act, will repeal \$14 billion in tax reduction subsidies and other outrageous benefits given to the big oil companies.

Many of these measures were included in legislation that was written in backroom and late-night meetings. With the passage of our ethics reform in this bill, we are fulfilling our responsibility to the American people to clean up Congress and reverse the past lapses that led us to where we are today.

□ 1045

Mr. Speaker, this legislation not only repeals the excesses given to oil companies, our bill uses the money to create a Strategic Renewable Energy Reserve. This will invest in clean renewable energy resources and alternative fuels, promote new energy technologies, develop greater efficiency and improve energy conservation. Investing in alternative and renewable energies and efficiency is not only about protecting the environment and homeland security, it is about promoting new industry and creating jobs.

This type of new investment will help create jobs and support industries in northeast Ohio, where we are already working on new energy technology through organizations like the Ohio Fuel Cell Coalition, which is working to strengthen Ohio's fuel cell industry.

I am proud to say that this coalition includes the University of Akron and the Lorain County Community College in my congressional district. This investment in new energy technology, combined with new incentives and initiatives to make higher education more accessible recently passed by this Congress, will help ensure that our students have the education and the skills necessary for the jobs of the future.

That is what we are doing here today, eliminating the abuses of the past and investing in our Nation's future. Let's pass the CLEAN Energy Act.

MAKING IN ORDER AT ANY TIME CONSIDERATION  
OF H.R. 475, HOUSE PAGE BOARD REVISION ACT  
OF 2007

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it shall be in order at any time without intervention of any point of order to consider in the House H.R. 475; the bill shall be considered as read; and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill to final passage without intervening motion except: 30 minutes of debate equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on House Administration, and one motion to recommit, with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CAPUANO). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Reserving my right to object, Mr. Speaker, and I may not object, but I don't have a copy of what the gentleman, my friend, was talking about. If the gentleman would explain the motion, because I was not shown a copy before.

Mr. MCGOVERN. This is on the Page Board issue, and the explanation is here. My understanding is that your side has had a copy of this.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. I have received it now. I certainly see no reason to object, and I withdraw my reservation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished Republican leader, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOEHNER).

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, let me thank my colleague for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, let me say to my colleagues that this is the seventh bill that has come to this floor that has not gone through committee, that has not had ample opportunity for amendment in subcommittee or full committee, no opportunity for an amendment on the floor on any of these bills, nor the opportunity for our side of the aisle to offer a substitute.

I am encouraged that the Rules Committee this week has organized and met, but I would note that as the Rules Committee opened, the first debate on the first rule where there was going to be a rule on the bill yesterday, the chairwoman of the Rules Committee made it clear before there were any witnesses before the Rules Committee, before there was any testimony, before there was any discussion, that this would be a closed rule, there would be no amendments, and there would be no substitute offered to the Members on our side of the aisle.

I come here today to talk to my colleagues. The gentleman from Massachusetts who is managing this rule for the majority knows exactly what I am talking about. We have had this discussion here for a long time.

I understand the need for the majority party to want to make its move, to make its first impression; and I understand the first couple of bills had to come flying right to the floor. But we are short-circuiting democracy here, and I think my colleagues on both sides of the aisle understand that.

On the opening day, when I handed the new Speaker the gavel, the first woman in the history of our country to be Speaker, I said that the House needed to work in a more bipartisan way. Over the course of the last several years, I heard my colleagues on the other side of the aisle talk about the need to work in a more bipartisan way.

I said also on the opening day that we do have different ideas about how to solve America's problems and that we should cherish the differences that we have, we should debate them, that we can disagree here without being disagreeable. I also said that we should be nice.

What I didn't say is that we shouldn't be silent, and I won't be silent on behalf of our Members on this side of the aisle.

I think that there is a lot to be gained in bringing legislation to the floor that has been through the subcommittee process, that has been through the committee process, that has an opportunity for a real Rules Committee debate and an opportunity for Members on both sides of the aisle to offer amendments, to allow the minority the opportunity to offer a sub-

stitute. That is what the American people want. Our Members represent some 48 percent of the American people, and we are being silenced in this process.

I understand it is in the process. The new majority has only had the majority for 2 weeks. But I am here today to ask my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to live up to the promises that were made, to live up to the desire to be treated fairly.

When we took control of this House in 1995, we had a lot of Members in the new majority then who said we ought to treat the Democrats the way they treated us, and I argued vociferously that that was not the right thing to do, that we should treat the new minority as we had asked to be treated. We worked and I worked to be sure that we were living up to our commitment to treat the then-Democrat minority as we wanted to be treated back in the early nineties when we were making an awful lot of noise.

Over the last year, there has been an awful lot of conversation coming from my colleagues on the other side of the aisle when they were in the minority to make things more fair.

Let me quote one of the pledges: "Bills should generally come to the floor under a procedure that allows open, full and fair debate, consisting of a full amendment process that grants the minority the right to offer its alternatives, including a substitute."

What we are asking for here is fairness, fairness in this process, so that all Members can participate in a deliberative process on behalf of our constituents. Our constituents are just as important as your constituents, and they have a right to be heard and their Members have a right to participate in this process.

So I ask my colleagues, when? When is the time going to come to live up to what you asked for, to live up to your promises, and to live up to your commitment?

#### MOTION TO ADJOURN

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to adjourn offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOEHNER).

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 184, nays 233, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 34]

YEAS—184

Aderholt	Bachus	Bilbray
Akin	Baker	Bilirakis
Alexander	Barrett (SC)	Bishop (UT)
Bachmann	Biggert	Blackburn